DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 510 EC 111 911

AUTHOR Nixon, John T.
TITLE A Humanistic-Behavioral Model for Training Regular Educators to Succeed with Public Law 94-142.
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the World Congress on Future Special Education (First, Stirling, Scotland, June 25 - July 1, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Sciences; Conceptual Schemes; Educational Methods; Federal Legislation; *Handicapped Children; Higher Education; Humanistic Education; Learning Theories; *Models; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The paper briefly reviews the argument for bridging the gap between the behavioral and humanistic schools of education and considers a teacher education model compatible with P.L. 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children Act). A synthesis model is described that looks at the need for a change in the system of training teachers and school management, based on combined learning theories of A. Bandura, C. Rogers, and S. Engelmann. It is reported that this approach is being taught by the author and colleagues in undergraduate educational psychology, and graduate and inservice special education formats. (Author/SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

130 #14

JUN 2 8 1978

- ED158510

Abstract

A brief review of the argument for bridging the gap between the behavioral and humanistic schools of education is presented. A synthesis model is described that looks at the need for a change in the system of training teachers and school management, based on combined learning theories of Bandura, Rogers and Engelmann. This approach is being taught by the author and colleagues in undergraduate educational psychology, and graduate and in-service special education formats.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Author

John T. Nixon, Ph.D., is currently visiting assistant professor of psychology and associate coordinator of the Accommodative Education Program, a Dean's Project (BEH Sponsored) at State University College - Potsdam, Potsdam, New York.

Address: Psychology Department
State University College - Potsdam
Potsdam, New York 13676

Telephone: 315-268-2950

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.E.C.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EC111911

A HUMANISTIC-BEHAVIORAL MODEL FOR TRAINING REGULAR EDUCATORS TO SUCCEED WITH PUBLIC LAW 94-142

With the advent of Public Law 94-142 and the various state laws requiring education for all handicapped children in the least restrictive setting, has come a perhaps justifiable fear that the field of education is not prepared. With individualized educational plans (IEP) required by the legislation, implicit is the need for an effective model for child-centered instruction that will provide an evaluative tool and recognize the inevitable need for all classrooms to become more accommodative of a wide range of individual differences. A model is explored in this writing that may assist in the transitional process.

Over the past several years, there has been a variety of articles (Robin, 1974; Nolan, 1974; Moss & Mayer, 1975), conferences ('75 - Temple, '76 - AABT, '77 - ASCD) and a teacher in-service training program (BSL/LOFT) focusing on the synthesis of applied behavioral and humanistic approaches in educational settings. This seems to evidence an interest in the practical use of two models that differ in philosophy and have traditionally been at odds for this difference. Both, however, are seen by practitioners and applied scholars as powerful tools in the sometimes difficult and always argumentative arena of education. Clinical Psychology is presently undergoing a similar synthesizing, as suggested by Meichenbaum (1974), Ellis (1974), and Mahoney (1977). From an appreciation of the usefulness of the humanistic and behavioral methods, we have developed the notion that a synthesis might produce an extremely effective educational model, embracing those elements of both which appear to be the strongest and mutually supportive. It might be noted that a useful comparision of behavioral and humanistic method considers the behavioral approaches to redesigning the classroom, not to the disciplinary efforts. When humanistically-oriented educators attack behavioral methods, many times their targets should be those who have made the value judgment

to maintain the classroom status quo, not the behavioral principles themselves.

Specifically then, we are suggesting that the development of an effective child-centered education model may benefit from a synthesis as described above. Lacking in the field is a comprehensive definition of "child-centered" education that is open-ended enough to satisfy humanists and yet specific enough to meet measurement requirements of behaviorists. Leading from apparent need, a model is herein proposed as an initial attempt to synthesize humanistic/behavioral technologies for an individually-oriented or child-centered (to use the current vernacular) classroom, geared to cope specifically with the accommodation of exceptional learners to regular classrooms, but useful with a wide variety of students, all of whom are traditionally in regular classes, but have special learning needs. This will be termed the Accommodative Education model. The primary purpose at this point, is obviously not to provide the final, documented effort of model development. It is, rather, directed to applied researchers, program developers and program evaluators in providing a cohesive framework in which to define competent, humanistic teaching or developing the Accommodative Educator as we call this individual.

This model derives from the informality and freedom of humanistic educators (Rogers, 1969; Silberman, 1970) and the behavioral model of precision measurement and careful planning of contingencies to shape desired terminal performance (Skinner, 1953; Bandura, 1969; Englemann, 1969). The model, as proposed, looks at three separate levels of the envisioned Accommodative Educator training/evaluation: 1) Program goals, 2) Enabling processes, and 3) Specific teaching skills. Each level proposed, whether goal, process or skill, is derived from humanistic educational approaches described by leading authors in both the U. S. and Britain (Neill, 1960; Weber, 1971; Nyquist, 1972; Silberman, 1970). On the other hand, it is believed that a framework is provided whereby individual and program measurement standards called

for by behavioral practitioners are present. Further, these standards are present to a sufficient degree to determine improvement or decline in the quality of the program. The following paragraphs describe the three levels of the Accommodative Education Model:

1) Program goals are seen as the outcome of a given program. Since the proposed model suggests that an end point of closure in education is not a useful concept, the processes of attaining these goals are measured (e.g., To what degree is the outcome met at present? How can we further meet these goals, etc.?).

2) Enabling processes are seen as those inputs that facilitate the movement of the program toward the program goals. To assess enabling processes, presence or non-presence of the specified enabler could be indicated, and notation made of the program goal to which the enabler is directed.

3) Teacher skills are, of course, those skills that a teacher needs to attain an Accommodative classroom. Evaluation of these teaching skills would be on a have/have-not basis and may be useful to teachers themselves, teacher educators, and program administrators.

It is generally seen that most program goals of child-centered classroom in many schools are confused and inconsistent, because the form varies so widely by setting and by time (Nixon, 1973). However, if we distill the essential elements from descriptions of child-centered programs, we arrive at a list of composite goals (see Figure 1). Although the listing is by no means exhaustive, most or all of these elements are present in most child-centered classrooms as they now exist. The goals shown may be seen as a basic framework to which local program developers may add to meet their individual needs. The goals listed in Figure 1 may be seen as the goals of the Accommodative Education model. They do not differ from the goals posited in the humanistic literature, rather the ways of attaining these goals are made more measurable, and the necessary skills of the Accommodative Educator are more precisely determined.

Insert Figure 1 About Here

The L.O.F.T. (Learning Opportunities for Teachers) model seen in Figure 2 (Dollar and Dollar, 1976) provides a uniquely succinct view of the sequential movement of a program toward child-centered practices. As the reader looks down the chart, progression is made from the stereotypical, traditional teacher-centered classroom of Management System 1 to a maximally child-centered classroom of Management System 6. Looking across this chart, progression downward is measured by the major recognized learning variables (Becker, Engelmann, & Thomas, 1971; Dollar, 1972), seen herein as goal enablers. This system of evaluating classroom practices becomes very useful in pinpointing where a particular teacher or teaching team is currently operating, and measuring planned change, both key elements to effective program evaluation.

Insert Figure 2 About Here

Undoubtedly, a debatable level of this Accommodative Education model is that of determining teaching skills necessary to bring about the desired program goals. Though a good deal of thought and survey has entered into this portion of the model, it should by no means be considered inclusive for all programs. As local schools form programs to meet needs of exceptional learners for their area, additions should be made to accommodate local needs. Figure 3, therefore, presents those minimal skills for a teacher to bring to an Accommodative classroom.

Insert Figure 3 About Here

The usefulness of this model will be tested over the 1978-80 academic years in this writer's area. It is believed that the model may prove useful to others. Further adaptation is encouraged; however, the author asks that he be kept informed for future revision and validation.

LEVEL I: THE GOALS OF ACCOMMODATIVE EDUCATION

Common Elements of Child-Centered Class

A. Learner

1. Human potential freed in cognitive, affective, creative, sensorimotor

2. High degree of mobility between centers; possible extension of learning out of classroom.

3. Individualization of instruction

   a. Assessment by criteria
   b. Programming by child/criteria
   c. Effective recordkeeping

4. Self-pacing (learner controls learning rate style). Gives learner responsibility for his own learning.

5. Vertical grouping

   * Necessity for single and/or ability grouping drops; allows children to work with mixed ages. Older helping younger/brighter helping slower.

B. Teacher

1. High degree of teacher planning

   a. Concept development (Criterion-referenced testing, correlated learning materials)
   b. Learning resource development
   c. Continual notation of each child's progress

2. Creation of relaxed, respectful atmosphere for learners; achieved through effective listening and personal relationships with each child.

C. Environment

1. Physical environment organized into learning centers.

   a. Media (e.g. reading game, filmstrip, etc.)
   b. Subject matter (e.g. math, reading, science)

2. Learning extended outside classroom

3. Integrated day

   * Except for short teacher-directed (entry, exit) time periods, time is not planned; learners are able to self-pace.

Figure 1

LEVEL II: ENABLING PROCESSES OF ACCOMMODATIVE EDUCATION

Grouping	Tasks	Time	Evaluation	Teacher Decisions	Learner Decisions
Heterogeneous Class	Same for all	Fixed Equal	None	Content Time/pace Learning resources Movement Response opportunity	When to raise hand (response opportunity) Level of attention
Small Heterogeneous	Same for each group	Fixed & Equal Change tasks on time	None	Content Sequence time Pace of direct instruction Learning resources	Level of attention Response opportunities within time level
Homogeneous "Ability" Grouping	Different for groups Different sequence Multi-sensory	Task completion Direct instruction Fixed for low group	Post tests Placement test	Groups Content Where to start Criteria for mastery Learning resources Number of tasks	Sequence of tasks Time/rate Response opportunities Movement (middle & high groups)
Individual	Student directed Self-checking Multi-sensory	Individual Controlled or variable task completion	Pre- and post tests Recordkeeping	Content Concept sequence Mastery level Direct instruction	Task sequence Starting point Modality of task Environment
Individual	Same as above	Same as above	Group criteria testing Individual pre-test Individual post-test Recordkeeping	Content Concept sequence Specified LOFT's	Task sequence LOFT's to be checked Tutors Conference Direct instruction

Figure 2

LEVEL III: THE TEACHING SKILLS OF ACCOMMODATIVE EDUCATION

The Accommodative teacher performs skillfully in:

1.0 Managing the classroom behavior of learners

- 1.1 Use of problem-solving approach to determine learner behavior patterns
- 1.2 Effects of consequences for learner
  - 1.2.1 Reinforcing consequences
  - 1.2.2 Punishing consequences
    - 1.2.2.1 Punishment as withdrawal of attention
    - 1.2.2.2 Punishment as time out
    - 1.2.2.3 Punishment as response cost
- 1.3 Creating reinforcers
  - 1.3.1 Teacher as major reinforcer
  - 1.3.2 Concrete reinforcers
  - 1.3.3 Token reinforcers
  - 1.3.4 Social/activity reinforcers
- 1.4 Scheduling consequences
- 1.5 Implementing behavior contracts

2.0 Selecting educational objectives based on:

- 2.1 Studies of the individual children in the class
  - 2.1.1 Sensorimotor characteristics
  - 2.1.2 Cognitive abilities
  - 2.1.3 Creativity
  - 2.1.4 Attitudes and feelings
- 2.2 Studies of the child's community
  - 2.2.1 Family and peer relationships
  - 2.2.2 The local community
  - 2.2.3 The society at large
- 2.3 Studies of the plausible future
  - 2.3.1 Socialization
  - 2.3.2 Management
  - 2.3.3 Communication
  - 2.3.4 Social groupings
  - 2.3.5 Institutions
  - 2.3.6 Technology
- 2.4 Studies of the skills and interests of the teacher staff as learning resources
- 2.5 Use of state and local curriculum guides

Figure 3

2.6 Awareness of "mainstream" values including . . .

2.6.1 Physical and mental health
2.6.2 Cooperation and moral judgment
2.6.3 The spirit of achivement
2.6.4 Cultural pluralism

2.7 Evaluation of personal teaching style

3.0 Specifying concepts clearly;

3.1 Developing each educational concept in terms of both knowledge and behavior to determine what a child should know and what a child should be able to do with that knowledge.

3.2 Selecting multi-modal, multi-sensory learning experiences in keeping with the concepts chosen:

3.2.1 Providing incidences of essential characteristics of the concept
3.2.2 Providing incidences of non-essential characteristics of the concept
3.2.3 Varying irrelevent characteristics of the concept

3.3 Providing opportunities to practice the tasks specified in the concepts

3.4 Sequencing and correlating tasks for each concept

4.0 Organizing the learning experiences through;

4.1 Arrangement of environment

4.1.1 Arrangement of environment for various types of activities
4.1.1.1 Presentations
4.1.1.2 Discussions
4.1.1.3 Making/building
4.1.1.4 Using instructional materials
4.1.1.5 Centers
4.1.2 Arrangement of space for various numbers of participants
4.1.2.1 Large groups
4.1.2.2 Small groups
4.1.2.3 Pairs
4.1.2.4 Individuals

4.2 Arrangement of materials

4.2.1 Obtaining materials
4.2.1.1 Developing resource network for materials
4.2.1.2 Ordering commercially-produced materials
4.2.1.3 Making teacher-produced materials
4.2.1.4 Having children and others in the class produce materials
4.2.2 Arranging materials within the environment

4.3 Arrangement of time

- 4.3.1 Scheduling regular daily and weekly activities that involve all students (beginning/ending day, class meetings, etc.)
- 4.3.2 Scheduling multi-level, multi-sensory activities to run concurrently
- 4.3.3 Scheduling with external constraints (school schedules, classroom schedules, community and cultural events)

4.4 Arrangement of resource persons

- 4.4.1 Guest presenters
- 4.4.2 Specialist observers and diagnosticians
- 4.4.3 Field trips
- 4.4.4 Volunteers (academic and non-academic participation)

4.5 Establishing consensus with the children on rules for:

- 4.5.1 Use of environment
- 4.5.2 Use of materials
- 4.5.3 Use of time
- 4.5.4 Interactions between students and student-adult
- 4.5.5 Which decisions will be made by individuals, by the group, or by the teachers

4.6 Employing various instructional strategies including:

- 4.6.1 Group discussions
- 4.6.2 Self-paced instruction
- 4.6.3 Lecture
- 4.6.4 Demonstrations: 1) teacher 2) resource person 3) peer
- 4.6.5 Group projects
- 4.6.6 Individual projects
- 4.6.7 Tutoring
- 4.6.8 Peer teaching
- 4.6.9 Games
- 4.6.10 A-V usage
- 4.6.11 Learning centers/interest centers

5.0 Evaluating the results of learning experiences through:

5.1 Collecting records related to the objectives

- 5.1.1 Pre-and post-tests for each concept
- 5.1.2 Anecdotal records
- 5.1.3 Time-sampled observations
- 5.1.4 Summaries of personal interviews
- 5.1.5 Standardized tests
- 5.1.6 Students' self-check sheets
- 5.1.7 Students' collections of saved products
- 5.1.8 Students' oral and written logs

5.2 Reflecting on the implications of the records

- 5.2.1 Referring children to appropriate resource persons
- 5.2.2 Locating appropriate professional resources for the teacher
- 5.2.3 Modifying the educational objectives

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. Principles of Behavior Modification, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Becker, W. C., Engelmann, S., Thomas, D. R. Teaching: A Course In Applied Psychology, Chicago: SRA, 1971.

Dollar, B. BSL/LOFT Classroom Management Systems, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Accelerated Learning Systems, 1976.

Dollar, B. Humanizing Classroom Discipline, New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Ellis, A. Humanistic Psychotherapy: The Rational Emotive Approach, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Engelmann, S. Conceptual Learning, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Adapt Press, 1969.

Mahoney, M. J. Reflections on the Cognitive-Learning Trends in Psychotherapy, American Psychologist, 1977, 32 (1), 5-13.

Meichenbaum, D. Cognitive Behavior Modification, Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1974.

Moss, J. W. & Mayer, D. L. Children With Intellectual Subnormality, in Gallagher, J. J. (ed.), The Application of Child Development Research to Exceptional Children, Reston, Virginia: CEC Press, 1975.

Nixon, J. T. The Relationship of Openness to Academic Performance, Critical Thinking, and School Morale in Two School Settings, unpublished dissertation, George Peabody College, 1973.

Nolan, J. D. The True Humanist: The Behavior Modifer, Teachers College Record, 1974, 76 (2), 335-43.

Nyquist, E. B., Ed. Open Education, New York: Bantam Press, 1972.

Robin, A. Behavior Modification an Open Education: Strange Bedfellows? Educational Technology, 1974 ( ) 49-53.

Rogers, C. Freedom to Learn, Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing, 19 .

Silberman, C. E. Crisis in the Classroom, New York: Random House, 1970.

Skinner, B. F. Science and Human Behavior, New York: MacMillan, 1953.

Weber, L. The English Infant School and Informal Education, Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersy: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

CONFERENCES LISTED

Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy (AABT), National Conference, New York City; December, 1976.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Conference, Houston, Texas; March, 1977.

Second Annual Temple Conference on Behavior Modification and Behavior Therapy, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; October, 1975.